arXiv:0904.3238v1 [quant-ph] 21 Apr 2009

Non-local quantum field correlations and detection processes in QFT

Fabrizio Buscemi[1, 2, *] and Giuseppe Compagno[3]

[1] *ARCES, Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Via Toffano 2/2, 40125 Bologna, Italy*

[2] *S3 Research Center, CNR-INFM, Via Campi 213/A, I-Modena 41100, Italy*

[3] *Dipartimento di Scienze fisiche ed astronomiche dell'Università di Palermo, Via Archirafi 36, 90123 Palermo, Italy*

(Dated: April 21, 2009)

Quantum detection processes in QFT must play a key role in the description of quantum field correlations, such as the appearance of entanglement, and of causal effects. We consider the detection in the case of a simple QFT model with a suitable interaction to exact treatment, consisting of a quantum scalar field coupled linearly to a classical scalar source. We then evaluate the response function to the field quanta of two-level point-like quantum model detectors, and analyze the effects of the approximation adopted in standard detection theory. We show that the use of the RWA, that characterizes the Glauber detection model, leads in the detector response to non-local terms corresponding to an instantaneously spreading of source effects over the whole space. Other detector models, obtained with non-standard or the no-application of RWA, give instead local responses to field quanta, apart from source independent vacuum contribution linked to preexisting correlations of zero-point field.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Pm, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta

*Electronic address: fabrizio.buscemi@unimore.it

I. INTRODUCTION

The appearance of non local effects in quantum mechanics has received great attention beginning from the well-known EPR paradox [1]. This indicates that the result of a measurement performed on one of a pair of correlated systems has a non-local effect on the correlated physical measurement on the partner distant system. Such a non-local behavior is related to the presence of quantum entanglement between the systems. Thus detection of quantum correlations between two separated systems plays a key role in establishing whether the systems are entangled or not. In particular models of measurements not causally connected are required to evaluate a genuine manifestation of the entanglement. In this case if correlations are detected they may violate Bell's inequality[2] and therefore the two systems can be considered as entangled. Instead some models of measurement, leading by their same nature to the instantaneous development of non-local effects over the whole space, could give rise in their interpretation to the appearance of entanglement even in the absence of real quantum correlations.

Another place where non-locality may manifest itself is in the spacetime evolution of single particle wavefunction that gives place to non zero contributions outside of the light-cone[3, 4, 5]. This aspect of non-locality in quantum mechanics, with the building up of probability on space-like distances, appears instead to give rise to a violation of causality. Non-local effects show up also in Quantum Field Theory (QFT) in the time evolution of initially localized quantum field states both for free fields and for interacting matter-field models [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10].

The use of appropriate model of the detection process for the interpretation of the measurements in the observation of non-local correlations plays a key role into evaluating the reality of these quantum correlations defining entanglement or even of effects that appear to not satisfy the causal propagation of signals. In this context it results thus to be important the adoption of suitable quantum detectors models, and the appropriate detector model that must be adopted appears to be still questioned [12, 13, 14, 15]. Different quantum detector models have been proposed in literature. Among them the Glauber detector (GD) model, longly used in photodetection theory and Quantum Optics [16], and the Unruh-DeWitt detector (UDD) model utilized to describe accelerated detectors and their excitations as response to the inertial vacuum [17, 18, 19, 20]. The GD model adopts the so-called ro-

tating wave approximation (RWA) whose application in the solution of QFT systems seems however to lead to the appearance of non-local effects [21, 22]. In particular, for the case of the interaction between atom and electromagnetic field within the dipole approximation, it has been shown that the use of the RWA leads to the atomic dipole being coupled to the field at points other than the position of the dipole[23]. From this point of view the GD model could result to be unappropriate in models of matter-field interaction in describing the experimental observation aimed to detect quantum entanglement. In fact by its nature this model gives rise to the appearance of quantum correlations over space-like distances which do not represent a manifestation of a genuine entanglement. Thus the use of GD model also could lead to appearance of violation of the causal propagation of signals, even if the effective connection between RWA and causality in the Glauber detection theory is yet debated. In particular, it has been shown that the photocounting probabilities for short observation times appear to violate causality[14, 15] and this has led some authors to suggest relevant modifications of the Glauber photodetection theory [14, 15]. Other investigations seem instead to indicate that an appropriate use of the RWA in the GD model guarantees causality [12].

Thus the observability and the measurement of quantum correlations in order to evidence entanglement and causal effects requires the use of appropriate detector models and in particular the adoption of a suitable Hamiltonian that not induces by itself non-locality. The aim of this paper is to discuss the typical models adopted in describing quantum detection processes and their relation to the possible appearance of non-local effects in the context of QFT. To this purpose in the first part of the paper we will analyze the GD model and the role played by the RWA into the appearance of effects over space-like distances. Then, in order to connect the measurement of quantum correlations to detection processes, we then shall analyze another suitable detector model and will obtain its response to the quantum field. To this end here we shall consider a system consisting of a quantum scalar field linearly interacting with a classical source localized in a finite spacetime region [11, 24, 25, 26]. Such a model, which can be exactly solved, appears to be of interest because it allows us to have a clear view of the role played by non-local effects in the quantum correlations in the system without the limitations linked to the perturbative calculations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we illustrate the GD and UDD models, while in Sec. III a non standard application of the RWA to the quantum detection of fields

generated by sources is analyzed. In Sec. IV we shall introduce the model of quantum scalar field coupled to a classical source and then evaluate the response function of the GD and UDD to the field for different situations. Finally in Sec. V we comment the results obtained.

II. QUANTUM DETECTION MODELS OF SCALAR FIELD

The quantum theory of photodetection, with the construction of a model of detector, as developed by Glauber [16] has played a key role in Quantum Optics. However other kinds of detectors have also been used in QFT, in particular, by [17, 18, 19, 20]. In both approaches the detectors are particle detectors and the detection process represents the quantum measurement to detect the quanta of the field. Here we shall utilize the GD and UDD models in the case of scalar fields detection [18].

A. Unruh-De Witt scalar detector

UDD model[17] is represented as an idealized particle of negligible spatial extension and with internal energy levels, coupled via a monopole interaction with a scalar field $\Phi(x)$. The latter may be expressed in terms of its positive and negative frequency part as:

$$\Phi(x) = \Phi^{+}(x) + \Phi^{-}(x) \tag{1}$$

where, taking $\hbar = 1$ and $c = 1$,

$$\Phi^{+}(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega}\, a(\mathbf{k}) e^{-ik\cdot x} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{-}(x) = \Phi^{+\dagger}(x). \tag{2}$$

$\omega = \sqrt{|\mathbf{k}|^2 + m^2}$ and $a(\mathbf{k})$, $a^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k})$ are respectively the usual annihilation and creation operators that satisfy the relativistic commutator rules:

$$\left[a(\mathbf{k}), a^{\dagger}(\mathbf{k}')\right] = 2\omega\delta^3(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'). \tag{3}$$

The detector is characterized by two energy levels ω_g and ω_e, with eigenstates $|g\rangle$ and $|\,e\rangle$ respectively. It moves along the line word line described by the function $x(\tau)$, with τ the proper time. The UDD model in the case of scalar fields is defined by the following interaction Hamiltonian:

$$H^{int}_{UDD} = -c_1 m(\tau)\Phi(x(\tau)), \tag{4}$$

with $m(\tau)$ the detector monopole moment and c_1 the field-detector coupling constant. Notice that H^{int}_{UDD} contains both conserving and non-conserving energy terms. We shall take the interaction turned on only for a finite time interval $\tau = \tau_f - \tau_i$. The state of the detector-field system at initial time τ_i is $|i\rangle = |g\,\psi_i\rangle = |g\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle$ where $|g\rangle$ is the detector state ground and $|\psi_i\rangle$ the field state.

Using the interaction picture the first order transition amplitude from $|g\,\psi_i\rangle$ to $|e\,\psi_f\rangle$ is:

$$A_{UDD|g\psi_i\rangle\to|e\psi_f\rangle} = \langle e\,\psi_f|U(t)|g\,\psi_i\rangle = ic_1 m_{eg}\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} e^{i\omega_{eg}\tau'}\langle\psi_f|\Phi(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle d\tau' \tag{5}$$

with $m_{eg} = \langle e|\widehat{m}(0)|g\rangle$ and $\omega_{eg} = \omega_e - \omega_g$. Using the positive and negative frequency parts of the field operator the matrix elements appearing within integral in Eq. (5) can be written as:

$$\langle\psi_f|\Phi^+(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle + \langle\psi_f|\Phi^-(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle, \tag{6}$$

with the first term describing the absorption and the second the emission of field quanta by the detector. In the UDD both the terms $\langle\psi_f|\Phi^+(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle$ and $\langle\psi_f|\Phi^-(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle$ contribute to the detector excitation amplitude and correspond respectively to detector excitation with absorption or emission of a field quantum. In particular the second term represents the response of the detector to the vacuum fluctuations. In order to have a better insight into the different kinds of processes occurring in the scalar field-UDD interaction, here we give the expression of the amplitude probability of excitation UDD in terms of annihilation and creation operators of scalar quanta. By inserting Eq. (2) in Eq. (5), we obtain:

$$A_{UDD|g\psi_i\rangle\to|e\psi_f\rangle} = \tag{7}$$
$$\frac{ic_1 m_{eg}}{(2\pi)^{3/2}}\int\frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega}\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} d\tau'\left[e^{ik\cdot\mathbf{x}(\tau)}e^{i(\omega_{eg}-\omega)\tau'}\langle\psi_f|a(\mathbf{k})|\psi_i\rangle + e^{-ik\cdot\mathbf{x}(\tau)}e^{i(\omega_{eg}+\omega)\tau'}\langle\psi_f|a^\dagger(\mathbf{k})|\psi_i\rangle\right],$$

where the emission of quanta of the field with energy ω, is given in the integrand by the factor $e^{i(\omega_{eg}+\omega)\tau'}$. The absorption process instead leads to the factor $e^{i(\omega_{eg}-\omega)\tau'}$ in the integrand of the above expression.

The probability of detection of the UDD is thus obtained by taking the square modulus of Eq. (5) and summing over all the possible field final states:

$$P_{UDD}(\tau_f,\tau_i) = c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f}\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} d\tau' d\tau'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(\tau''-\tau')}\langle\psi_i|\Phi(x(\tau'))\Phi(x(\tau''))|\psi_i\rangle \tag{8}$$

From the above expression it comes out that the response of detector depends on the motion of the detector itself, the well-known Unruh effect is in fact related to this property. The

response of a uniformly accelerated UDD with acceleration α to the vacuum fluctuations is the same of a unaccelerated UDD immersed in a bath of thermal radiation at temperature $T = 1/(2\pi k\alpha)$ [17].

B. Glauber scalar detector

The GD model[16], commonly adopted in quantum optics, is obtained by applying the RWA in the interaction term. The use of such an approximation, which permits to easily evaluate the photodetection probability, is valid as long as the measurement time and pulse length of detected field are long compared to a typical optical cycle.

The RWA can analogously be applied for the case of scalar detection in the field-detector interaction Hamiltonian of Eq. (4). It reduces to the Hamiltonian

$$H_{GD}^{int} = -c_1 \left[m_{ge}(\tau)|g\rangle\langle e|\Phi^-(x(\tau)) + m_{eg}(\tau)|e\rangle\langle g|\Phi^+(x(\tau))\right] \tag{9}$$

where the closure relation for detector eigenstates $|g\rangle\langle g| + |e\rangle\langle e| = \mathbb{I}$ has been used and $m_{e(g)g(e)}(\tau) = \langle e(g)|\widehat{m}(\tau)|g(e)\rangle$. Note that in the above expression do not appear the anti-resonant terms $m_{eg}(\tau)\,|e\rangle\langle g|\Phi^-(x(\tau))$ and $m_{ge}(\tau)\,|g\rangle\langle e|\Phi^+(x(\tau))$, which describe the creation of scalar quanta with excitation of the detector and the annihilation of scalar quanta with the decay of the detector, respectively. In fact the RWA implies the neglection of such counter-rotating terms.

According to this model the detection is only considered as an absorption process. As seen from Eq. (7), in the term describing the emission of quanta of the field the factor $e^{i(\omega_{eg}+\omega)\tau'}$ appears, which is rapidly oscillating and gives a negligible contribution for $(\tau_f - \tau_i) \gg 1/w_{eg}$. In this sense such a process can be considered virtual, since it can occur only for short time intervals $(\tau_f - \tau_i)$ obeying $\omega_{eg}(\tau_f - \tau_i) \lesssim 1$ and moreover does not conserve energy. Instead the absorption process is given in the integrand by the factor $e^{i(\omega_{eg}-\omega)\tau'}$. The adoption of RWA forbids the virtual transitions where the energy is not conserved. This implies that the only term, that now comes out in Eq. (5), is the matrix element $m_{eg}\,\langle\psi_f|\Phi^+(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle$, thus only the positive frequency part of the field appears in the first order amplitude transition from the initial state $|g\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$ to $|e\rangle|\psi_f\rangle$ for the GD model. This is given by

$$A_{GD_{|g\psi_f\rangle\to|e\psi_i\rangle}} = ic_1 m_{eg} \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f} e^{i\omega_{eg}\tau'}\langle\psi_f|\Phi^+(x(\tau'))|\psi_i\rangle d\tau' \tag{10}$$

and then leads to the probability detection:

$$P_{GD}(\tau_f,\tau_i)=c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f}\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f}d\tau' d\tau'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(\tau''-\tau')}\langle\psi_i|\Phi^-(x(\tau'))\Phi^+(x(\tau''))|\psi_i\rangle. \tag{11}$$

The response of the GD to the vacuum field state $|0\rangle$ is

$$P_{GD}(\tau_f,\tau_i)=c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f}\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_f}d\tau' d\tau'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(\tau''-\tau')}\langle 0|\Phi^-(x(\tau'))\Phi^+(x(\tau''))|0\rangle=0 \tag{12}$$

The GD, as a consequence of the RWA, does therefore not feel the zero point vacuum fluctuations. From Eq. (12) it follows also that the response of the GD to the vacuum does not depend from the state of the motion of the same detector. The detection probability vanishes in particular for detectors travelling either along inertial or accelerated world lines. Therefore such a detector can not show the well known Unruh effect.

The adoption of the GD model, with its use of the RWA, to detect quantum correlations due to entanglement appears to be controversial in QFT systems[12, 14, 15]. By applying an approach already used in the photodetection of free electromagnetic fields [14, 15], here we want to show the appearance of non- local effects in the Glauber scalar detection theory. To this aim we examine a free quantum scalar field $|\Psi\rangle$, expressed as

$$|\Psi\rangle=\int\frac{d^3\mathbf{k}'}{2\omega}\,|\alpha(\mathbf{k}')\rangle \tag{13}$$

where the state $|\alpha(\mathbf{k}')\rangle$ is the eigenstate of the annihilation operator $a(\mathbf{k})$ with eigenvalue $\alpha(\mathbf{k})$

$$a(\mathbf{k})|\alpha(\mathbf{k}')\rangle=\alpha(\mathbf{k})|\alpha(\mathbf{k}')\rangle. \tag{14}$$

and therefore $|\Psi\rangle$ is the coherent state satisfying $a(\mathbf{k})|\Psi\rangle=\alpha(\mathbf{k})|\Psi\rangle$. Taking into account Eqs. (1), (13) and (14), the action of the operator $\Phi^+(x)$ on $|\Psi\rangle$ gives

$$\Phi^+(x)|\Psi\rangle=V(x)|\Psi\rangle, \tag{15}$$

where

$$V(x)=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}}\int\frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{2\omega}\,e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}-\omega t)}\alpha(\mathbf{k}). \tag{16}$$

It may easily be shown that $V(x)$ satisfies the classical homogeneous Klein-Gordon equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t^2}-\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{x}^2}+m^2\right)V(x)=0, \tag{17}$$

and can be therefore interpreted as a classical signal propagating freely. In Eq. (16) it appears only the factor $e^{-i\omega t}$ with $\omega>0$. Extending t to a complex variable,this corresponds in the

complex plane $t = t_1 - it_2$, to the appearance of the term $e^{-\omega t_2}$. $V(x)$ is thus an analytical function in the lower complex t halfplane and then its real and imaginary parts are therefore related by a Hilbert transformation,

$$\mathrm{Im}\, V(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Re}\, V(\mathbf{x}, t')}{t - t'} dt'. \tag{18}$$

Now we can easily evaluate the time evolution of quantities of interest in terms of $V(x)$. The first order Glauber correlation function is defined as

$$G(x, x) = \langle \Phi^-(x)\Phi^+(x) \rangle, \tag{19}$$

and therefore is given by the expectation value of the operator $\Phi^-(x)\Phi^+(x)$ on the quantum field state. Such a function permits to estimate the rate of scalar quanta counting probability. By inserting Eqs. (13) and (14) in (19), we obtain for it:

$$G(x, x) = |V(x)|^2 = (\mathrm{Re}\, V(x))^2 + (\mathrm{Im}\, V(x))^2. \tag{20}$$

The mean value of the scalar field operator $\Phi(x)$ has instead the form:

$$\langle \Psi | \Phi(x) | \Psi \rangle = 2\, \mathrm{Re}\, V(x). \tag{21}$$

Let us consider a signal $V(x)$ consisting of a plane wave with a sharp front moving in the positive $\mathbf{z}$ axis direction whose the real part is given by

$$\mathrm{Re}V(x) = \Theta(t - \mathbf{z}) f(\mathbf{z} - t), \tag{22}$$

where Θ is the Heaviside function and

$$f(\mathbf{z} - t) = \left.\begin{array}{ccc} f_0 & \text{for} & t - \mathbf{z} \in [0, \Delta\bar{\mathbf{z}}] \\ 0 & \text{for} & t - \mathbf{z} \notin [0, \Delta\bar{\mathbf{z}}] \end{array}\right\} \tag{23}$$

with $\Delta\bar{z}$ indicating the signal length here assumed to be small. We note from Eqs. (21) and (22) that ReV and therefore the mean value of the field reaches the detector at time $t = \mathbf{z}$ and is equal to 0 for $t < \mathbf{z}$. ImV, related by Eq. (18) to ReV will be given by

$$\mathrm{Im}V(x) = \frac{f_0}{\pi} \ln \left| \frac{t - \mathbf{z}}{t - \mathbf{z} - \Delta\bar{\mathbf{z}}} \right|. \tag{24}$$

It results to differ from zero for all t even if Re$V = 0$ for $t < \mathbf{z}$. Therefore the Glauber correlation function $\langle \Phi^-(x)\Phi^+(x) \rangle$ written in Eq. (20) does not vanishes before $\langle \Phi(x) \rangle$ for $t < \mathbf{z}$. Such a result implies that the GD model, leading by its very nature to the development of effects over space-like distances, is unappropriate to detect both the appearance of entanglement and causality in the time evolution of free fields [14, 15].

III. A NON STANDARD APPLICATION OF THE RWA TO QUANTUM DETECTION THEORY

In the previous section we have seen that non-locality shows up at level of Glauber detection of free scalar fields. This induces first to inquire if such a behavior may be observed when other kinds of detectors are used, and then to examine the detection processes in the case of field generated by quantum sources.

In particular, we shall here investigate the role played by a "non standard" application of the RWA to the quantum detection theory for the case of quantum scalar fields interacting with sources. Starting from a complete Hamiltonian H, which contains conserving and non-conserving energy terms, the detection probability rate for the UDD point-like at rest and localized at $\mathbf{x}$ with $x(\tau) = x = (\mathbf{x}, t)$ is given by the time derivative of Eq. (8) and can be expressed as

$$\dot{P}_{UDD}(t) = 2c_1^2 |m_{eg}|^2 \mathrm{Re} \int_0^t dt' \langle \psi_i | \Phi(\mathbf{x}, t) \Phi(\mathbf{x}, t') | \, \psi_i \rangle e^{i\omega_{eg}(t'-t)} \tag{25}$$

where we have assumed that the field detector interaction is turned from $\tau_i = 0$ to $\tau_f = t$. We shall analyze the detection probability rate in the Heinseberg picture. It has again the form of Eq. (25) where $\Phi'(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is now the Heisenberg operator satisfying the equation of the motion:

$$\frac{\partial \Phi' \mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = i[H, \Phi'(\mathbf{x}, t)] \tag{26}$$

Following the same approach previously adopted in QED [12], a formal solution of Eq. (26) can be expressed by writing the Heinseberg operator $\Phi'(\mathbf{x}, t)$ as

$$\Phi'(\mathbf{x}, t) = \Phi'_0(\mathbf{x}, t) + \Phi'_{RR}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \Phi'_s(\mathbf{x}, t) \tag{27}$$

with $\Phi'_0(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the free field, $\Phi'_{RR}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the radiation reaction field of the detector on itself while $\Phi'_s(\mathbf{x}, t)$ indicates the field due to the source. The retarded source-field can be expressed as $\Phi'_s(\mathbf{x}, t) = F'(\mathbf{x}, t)\Theta(t - r)$, where Θ is the Heaveside function guaranteeing causality and therefore

$$\Phi'(\mathbf{x}, t) = \Phi'_0(\mathbf{x}, t) + \Phi'_{RR}(\mathbf{x}, t) + F'(\mathbf{x}, t)\Theta(t - r). \tag{28}$$

In the above expression we have assumed the external field source to be at distance r from the point-like detector localized at $\mathbf{x}$.

Now let us define

$$\widetilde{\Phi'}^{+(-)}(\mathbf{x},t) = \Phi_0'^{+(-)}(\mathbf{x},t) + \Phi_{RR}'^{+(-)}(\mathbf{x},t) + \widetilde{\Phi'}_s^{+(-)}(\mathbf{x},t), \tag{29}$$

where $\Phi_0'^{+(-)}$ and $\Phi_{RR}'^{+(-)}$ are the positive (negative) frequency parts of the free and reaction radiation field respectively and $\widetilde{\Phi'}_s^{+(-)}$ is

$$\widetilde{\Phi'}_s^{+(-)}(\mathbf{x},t) = F'^{+(-)}(\mathbf{x},t)\Theta(t-r) \tag{30}$$

with $F'^{+(-)}$ indicating the positive (negative) frequency part of F'.

For time intervals larger than $1/\omega_{eg}$ we can adopt the approximation already used by Milonni *et al.* to treat the electromagnetic field case [12]. This consists in approximating Eq. (25) with the expression

$$\dot{P}_{UDD}(t) \simeq \dot{P}_{MD}(t) = 2|m_{eg}|^2 \mathrm{Re} \int_0^t dt' \langle\psi_i|\widetilde{\Phi'}^{-}(\mathbf{x},t)\widetilde{\Phi'}^{+}(\mathbf{x},t)|\psi_i\rangle e^{i\omega_{eg}(t'-t)} \quad \text{for} \quad t \gg 1/\omega_{eg}, \tag{31}$$

which can be considered as the rate detection probability, evaluated in the Heinseberg picture, of a new scalar quantum detector model, that is the "Milonni detector" (MD). In Eq. (31), instead of the field operator $\Phi(\mathbf{x},t)$ which appears in Eq. (25) and thus contains also terms including positive and negative frequency parts , such as $\Phi'^{+}\Phi'^{-}$, only the combination $\widetilde{\Phi'}^{-}\widetilde{\Phi'}^{+}$ is present.

We stress that the approximation used in Eq. (31), has been applied only after calculating the fields based on full Hamiltonian including conserving and non-conserving energy terms. Now we will show that this way of using such an approximation represents a non standard application of the RWA as originally performed in Glauber formulation and as a matter of fact a different one. In fact from the Eq. (30) we observe that while $\widetilde{\Phi'}_s^{+(-)}$ gives the retarded positive (negative) frequency part of the external source field it does not coincide with positive (negative) frequency part of the retarded operator Φ_s' which should be inserted according to the standard application of the RWA. Indeed the Θ function by itself consists of positive and negative frequency parts as:

$$\Theta(\tau) = \Theta^{-}(\tau) + \Theta^{+}(\tau) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{-1}{2\pi i}\left\{\int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{d\omega\, e^{-i\omega\tau}}{\omega + i\epsilon} + \int_0^{\infty} \frac{d\omega\, e^{-i\omega\tau}}{\omega + i\epsilon}\right\}. \tag{32}$$

Therefore the causally retarded source field $\widetilde{\Phi'}_s^{+(-)}$ contains both positive and negative frequency components. The approach here described that replaces in the detection probability

rate of Eq. (31) the full retarded fields with the retarded positive (negative) frequency part of the field is different from the standard form of the RWA that is performed at the beginning in the Glauber detection theory in the Hamiltonian of the system. This gives place to the detection rate probability of the defined MD, whose use prevents the development of quantum correlations over space-like distances as we now will show.

By taking in the rate detection probability of MD, given by Eq. (31), as the initial field state the vacuum state $|\psi_i\rangle = |\,0\rangle$ and then inserting Eqs. (29) and (30) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{P}_{MD}(t) = 2|m_{eg}|^2 \mathrm{Re} \int_0^t dt' \Bigg[& \langle \Phi'^{-}_{RR}(\mathbf{x},t)\Phi'^{+}_{RR}(\mathbf{x},t')\rangle \\ & + \Theta(t'-r)\langle \Phi'^{-}_{RR}(\mathbf{x},t)F'^{+}(\mathbf{x},t')\rangle + \Theta(t-r)\langle F'^{-}(\mathbf{x},t)\Phi'^{+}_{RR}(\mathbf{x},t')\rangle \\ & + \Theta(t-r)\Theta(t'-r)\langle F'^{-}_{-}(\mathbf{x},t)F'^{+}(\mathbf{x},t')\rangle \Bigg] e^{i\omega_{eg}(t'-t)} \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Under the assumption that the monopole detector atom is only weakly perturbed the above expression becomes, similarly to the electromagnetic field case [12]:

$$\dot{P}_{MD}(t) \cong 2|m_{eg}|^2 \Theta(t-r) \mathrm{Re} \int_r^t dt' \langle F'^{-}(\mathbf{x},t)F'^{+}(\mathbf{x},t')\rangle e^{i\omega_{eg}(t'-t)} \tag{34}$$

The presence of the function $\Theta(t-r)$ in the rate probability expression guarantees that the influence of the source-field is is not vanishing only inside the light-cone centered on the external field source. Thus the adoption of the MD for models of matter-field interaction being the sources quantum, like the in Fermi model [7, 27], or classical like in other models [11, 24, 25] does not lead to quantum correlations spreading in the whole space and is moreover causal , even if such a behavior appears to be "forced" by the approximation used in rate detection probability.

IV. THE QUANTUM DETECTION IN A SCALAR QFT MODEL

An analysis of the measurement and the possible observability of quantum correlations must use suitable detectors and can be strictly accomplished within exactly solvable physical models. In this spirit a simple QFT system, consisting of a quantum scalar field coupled to a classical source, has been recently investigated with none of the limitations related to perturbative calculations. So it appears of interest to study for this system the response of the various detectors to the field generated by localized sources.

A. The model

We consider a QFT model of a quantum scalar field $\Phi(x)$ linearly interacting with a classical scalar source $j(x)$, assumed to be localized in a finite spacetime region and turned for a finite time[11, 24, 25]. The Hamiltonian term describing the interaction is given by:

$$H_{int}(t) = g\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d^3\mathbf{x}\Big(\Phi^+(\mathbf{x},t) + \Phi^-(\mathbf{x},t)\Big)j(\mathbf{x},t) = H^+_{int}(t) + H^-_{int}(t) \tag{35}$$

where g is the source-field coupling constant.

Initially ($t = 0$) the field is taken in its vacuum state $|0\rangle$. The state $|t\rangle$, describing the system at time t, will be

$$|t\rangle = U(t)|0\rangle \tag{36}$$

where $U(t)$ is the interaction picture time evolution operator. Solving the equation of motion that derives from Eq. (35) we get for $U(t)$ a formal expression valid at all orders in g as:

$$U(t) = \exp\left(-i\int_0^t dt' H^-_{int}(t')\right)\exp\left(-i\int_0^t dt' H^+_{int}(t')\right)e^{-\xi(t)}e^{\alpha(t)}. \tag{37}$$

In Eq. (37) the coefficients $\alpha(t)$, $\xi(t)$ depend explicitly on the source as:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(t) &= \frac{ig^2}{2}\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^t dt_2\int d^3\mathbf{x}_1\int d^3\mathbf{x}_2\, j(\mathbf{x}_1,t_1)\Delta_-(\mathbf{x}_1-\mathbf{x}_2,t_1-t_2)j(\mathbf{x}_2,t_2) \qquad (38)\\ \xi(t) &= \frac{ig^2}{2}\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^t dt_2\int d^3\mathbf{x}_1\int d^3\mathbf{x}_2\,\Delta(\mathbf{x}_1-\mathbf{x}_2,t_1-t_2)j(\mathbf{x}_1,t_1)j(\mathbf{x}_2,t_2)\Theta(t_1-t_2)\end{aligned}$$

where Δ is the two-point function, given by the field commutator as $[\Phi(x),\Phi(y)] = i\Delta(x-y)$, and Δ_- is its negative frequency part [28, 29].

It has been previously shown that the dynamics of any local observable $\widehat{O}(\Phi(x),\partial_\mu\Phi(x))$, satisfying the micro-causality principle and represented by an analytical function of the field operator and its space and time derivatives, depends causally on the source[25, 26]. With this model the presence of non-locality has also been investigated by analyzing the localization properties of average values of local operators in connection to Hegerfeldt's theorem [3, 4, 5] which seems to imply causality violation for the time evolution of the wavefunctions, and one-point positive localization observables. In the same spirit and in the connection to the relevance of the detection theory for relating the results of measurements with the form of quantum correlation functions here we will evaluate the expectation values, on the quantum state $|t\rangle$ describing the system, of the Glauber and Newton-Wigner operators, which have recently been used in QFT models both of free fields and of matter-field interaction [6, 7].

The Glauber operator for the scalar field is defined as $\widehat{\rho}_G(x) = \Phi^-(x)\Phi^+(x)$ and its expectation value on the state $|t\rangle$ is

$$\langle t|\widehat{\rho}_G(x)|t\rangle = g^2\widetilde{\Delta}_+(x-y)\widetilde{\Delta}_-(x-y) \tag{39}$$

where the function $\widetilde{\Delta}_+\left(\widetilde{\Delta}_-\right)$, defined as

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_\pm(x-y) \equiv \int_0^t dt' \int d^3\mathbf{x}'\Delta_\pm(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}', t-t')j(\mathbf{x}', t'), \tag{40}$$

is not zero outside the light cone containing the source. Therefore the expectation value of $\widehat{\rho}_G$ given by Eq. (39) does not show a causal behavior.

The Newton-Wigner operator for scalar field has instead the form [7, 30, 31]:

$$\rho_{NW}(x) = a^\dagger_{NW}(x)a_{NW}(x) \tag{41}$$

where $a^\dagger_{NW}(x)$ and $a_{NW}(x)$ may be expressed in terms of the negative(positive) frequency part of the field operator $\Phi(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} a^\dagger_{NW}(x) &= R(\mathbf{x})\Phi^-(x) \\ a_{NW}(x) &= R(\mathbf{x})\Phi^+(x) \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where

$$R(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{2}\left(m^2 - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{x}}\right)^2\right)^{1/4}. \tag{43}$$

$R(\mathbf{x})$ is a non local operator that may be shown to correspond to a non local integral transformation[31]. The expectation value of $\rho_{NW}(x)$ on $|t\rangle$ is:

$$\langle t|\rho_{NW}(x)|t\rangle = g^2R(\mathbf{x})\widetilde{\Delta}_+(x-y)R(\mathbf{x})\widetilde{\Delta}_-(x-y) \tag{44}$$

The expectation value of the Newton Wigner operator ρ_{NW} on $|t\rangle$ immediately shows a local behavior. In fact it contains the action of the non local operator $R(\mathbf{x})$ on the functions $\widetilde{\Delta}_+(x-y)$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_-(x-y)$ which already, present contributions outside the light-cone centered on the source. Non-local effects shown by both the Glauber and Newton-Wigner operators are however attributable to the fact that these operators do not satisfy the micro-causality principle [25]. This implies that the measurement on one spacetime point has influence another point at a space-like distance.

B. Response of UD detector

The appearance in the scalar model of non-local effects seems to be at variance with the results found in previous works that use local operator functions of the field and of its time and space derivatives [25, 26]. However they are connected to the use of localization operators that do not satisfy the micro-causality principle. All of this stresses once more the key role played by a proper detection theory in the question concerning non-locality and measurement of quantum correlations due to to a genuine entanglement and of causal effects. Here we will calculate explicitly the response of the point-like UD detector to the field in our QFT scalar model.

In order to keep the problem simple we will assume the detector at rest at space point $\mathbf{x}$, so that the function describing its world line becomes $x(\tau) = x = (\mathbf{x}, t)$. Therefore the effects, that depend from the motion of the detector, as the Unruh ones, will not appear in the detection probability. Moreover we shall assume that the source coupled to the quantum field is classical and localized within a sufficiently small spacetime region around the spacetime point $y = (\mathbf{y}, y_0)$. This source is thus effectively point-like and we shall assume that it is turned on and off for an infinitesimal time interval. In this case from Eq. (37), the quantum field state describing the evolving system at time t takes the form:

$$|t\rangle = \exp\Big(- ig\Theta(t - y_0)\Phi^-(y)\Big)|0\rangle e^{\alpha_0(t)} \tag{45}$$

with

$$\alpha_0(t) = \frac{ig^2}{2}\,\Theta^2(t - y_0)\lim_{x\to 0}\Delta_-(x). \tag{46}$$

The above expression for $\alpha_0(t)$ is formally divergent. Therefore one should regularize the spacetime integrals by using a cut-off λ which makes the source localized in a small, but not exactly point-like, spacetime region and we shall consider the limit $\lambda \to \infty$ in those matrix elements where λ appears. However we will see that in our case the matrix elements, we are interested in, do not depend from the regularization of the integrals.

Using Eqs. (45) and (46) in Eq. (8) the detection probabilities to the field generated by the source can then be evaluated with no kind of approximation and becomes

$$P_{UDD} = c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2 \int_{t_i}^{t_f}\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt'dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(t''-t')}\langle t_i|\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t')\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t'')|t_i\rangle \tag{47}$$

where we have assumed that the UDD-field interaction occurs in the interval time $[t_f, t_i]$. Three different physical situations can occur for: $y_0 < t_i$, $t_i < y_0 < t_f$, and $t_f < y_0$.

i) $\mathbf{y_0 < t_i}$. The classical point-like source is turned on at $y_0 < t_i$. In this case the response of the UDD takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} P_{UDD} &= P_1(t_f,t_i) + g^2|P_2(s_f,s_i)|^2 \\ &= c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2 \int_{t_i}^{t_f}\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt'dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(t''-t')}\langle 0|\Phi(\mathbf{x},t')\Phi(\mathbf{x},t'')|0\rangle \\ &\quad + g^2c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2\Theta^2(t_i-y_0)\left|\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\Delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y},t''-y_0)\right|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where Δ is the propagator function coming from the field commutator $[\Phi(x),\Phi(y)] = i\Delta(x-y)$ and is vanishing when its argument is space-like. Therefore to the last time integral of Eq. (48) contribute only the values of $\Delta(x)$ such that x is inside the light-cone centered on the spacetime point y, where the classical source is localized. The detection probability for UDD can be seen to made of two terms. The first representing the vacuum contribution to the detector response function, is source independent and and presents non zero contributions outside the light-cone centered on the source. The second is source dependent and, as shown in Appendix A, $P_2(s_f,s_i)$ can be put in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} &P_2(s_f,s_i) \\ &= 2c_1|m_{eg}|\Theta(t_i-y_0)\Theta(s_f^2)\left[\Theta(-s_i^2)\left(F_1(0,s_f^2) - \frac{e^{i\omega_{eg}(r+y_0)}}{8\pi r}\right) + \Theta(s_i^2)F_1(s_i^2,s_f^2)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where $F_1(u^2,v^2)$ is defined in Eq. (A3) and $s^2_{f(i)} = (t_{f(i)}-y_0)^2 - r^2$ with $r = |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}|$. Because $\Theta(s_f^2)$ appears in the expression (49), the source dependent contribution of the UDD detector response turns out to be automatically causally retarded

ii) $\mathbf{t_i < y_0 < t_f}$. The field-classical source coupling is turned in the time interval $[t_f,t_i]$. We can analyze this situation assuming that the coupling of the detector with the field is turned on from t_i to $y_0-\epsilon$ and from $y_0+\epsilon$ to t_f, while the source-field interaction is effective in the interval time from $y_0-\epsilon$ to $y_0+\epsilon$. Then we will take the limit $\epsilon \to 0$ in the expressions obtained. Following the same procedure used to calculate the response of detector in the previous situation, we obtain for the UDD probability detection

$$P_{UDD} = P_1(t_f,t_i) + g^2|P_2(s_f,0)|^2. \tag{50}$$

Again $P_1(t_f,t_i)$ represents the vacuum response contribution and coincides with the one of Eq. 48 while $P_2(s_f,0)$ is linked to the variation of the source and is given in this case by

$$P_2(s_f,0) = 2c_1 m_{eg}\Theta(s_f^2)\left(F_1(0,s_f^2) - \frac{e^{i\omega_{eg}(r+y_0)}}{8\pi r}\right) \tag{51}$$

where we have assumed $\lim_{x\to 0_+}\Theta(x) = 1$. Also in this case we observe that the source dependent part of the UDD response is vanishing outside the light-cone centered on the source.

iii) $\mathbf{t_f < y_0}$. The classical point-like source is turned on at $y_0 > t_f$. Such a physical situation is not of interest for evaluating the detector response of the field generated by the source. In fact in this case the quantum field state describing our system in the time interval $[t_i, t_f]$ is the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ and therefore the response of the UDD is simply given by vacuum contribution with $P_{UDD} = P_1(t_f, t_i)$.

The results presented in this section show that the use UDD to detect field generated by a classical point-like source does not give rise to the instantaneous appearance of quantum correlation over the whole space and therefore the UDD response is causally retarded. This causal behavior comes out naturally from the detector models and is not put in a sense by "hand".

C. Response of Glauber detector

In relation to the causal response of the UDD to the field generated by the classical source, localized in space and time, in our scalar QFT model it appears also of interest to evaluate here the response of the GD model on order to see how realistic its use in order to to determine the structures of quantum correlations function. As seen in Sec. II, its use for free fields leads by its very nature to the development of effects developing over space-like distances and at variance with Einstein's causality.

In a manner analogous to the calculation of UDD response, here we again consider a source localized in an infinitesimal spacetime region around the space time point$y$. The detection probability for the Glauber detector P_{GD}, assumed to be at rest and located in $\mathbf{x}$, may thus be obtained by inserting Eqs. (45) and (46) in Eq. (11)

$$P_{GD} = c_1^2 |m_{eg}|^2 \int_{t_i}^{t_f}\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt' dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(t''-t')} \langle t_i|\Phi^-(\mathbf{x}, t')\Phi^+(\mathbf{x}, t'')|t_i\rangle. \tag{52}$$

Again three different configurations may be considered.

i) $\mathbf{y_0 < t_i}$. In this case the response of the GD, as shown in the explicit calculation of Appendix, may be expressed as:

$$P_{GD} = g^2 \left|\frac{1}{2}P_2(s_f, s_i) + P_3(s_f, s_i)\right|^2 \tag{53}$$

with $P_2(s_f, s_i)$ and $P_3(s_f, s_i)$ given with respect by Eq. (49) and

$$P_3(s_f, s_i) = c_1|m_{eg}|\Theta(t_i - y_0)\Bigg[\Theta(s_f^2)\Bigg(\Theta(s_i^2)F_2(s_i^2, s_f^2) + \Theta(-s_i^2)\big(F_2(0, s_f^2) + F_3(s_i^2, 0)\big)\Bigg) + \Theta(-s_f^2)F_3(s_i^2, s_f^2)\Bigg], \tag{54}$$

where $F_2(u^2, v^2)$ and $F_3(u^2, v^2)$ are defined in the Eqs. (A9) and (A10). We observe in Eq. (53) that all terms are source dependent. In particular from the expression (54) we also note the Heaviside function $\Theta(-s^2)$ appears in $P_3(s_f, s_i)$. This implies that GD may instantaneously respond to the variation of the source giving rise to non-locality in our model in agreement with what seen in Sec II.

ii) $\mathbf{t_i < y_0 < t_f}$. The GD detection probability is:

$$P_{GD} = g^2 \left|\frac{1}{2}P_2(s_f, 0) + P_3(s_f, r)\right|^2 \tag{55}$$

where $P_2(s_f, 0)$ is given in Eq. (51) and $P_3(s_f, r)$ is defined as

$$P_3(s_f, r) = c_1 m_{eg}\Bigg[\Theta(s_f^2)\Bigg(F_2(0, s_f^2) + F_3(-r^2, 0)\Bigg) + \Theta(-s_f^2)F_3(-r^2, s_f^2)\Bigg].$$

We note that again in the detection probability of Eq. (55), consisting of all source dependent contributions, non causal terms appear .

iii) $\mathbf{t_f < y_0}$. In this case the response of the GD vanishes, because this detector model is not sensitive to the vacuum fluctuations.

Finally we point that the appearance of non-causal terms in the response function of GD, given in Eqs. (53) and (55), cannot be related to the zero-point vacuum fluctuations, differently from what happens for UDD detector. Thus non-causal behavior must be ascribed to the fact that the quantity $\Phi^-\Phi^+$ which does not satisfy the micro-causality principle, appears in the probability of detection for GD, given by Eq. (11), as a consequence of the standard application of the RWA. This is again in agreement with the previous results showing that the use of the RWA leads to the development,over space like distances, of quantum correlations not describing genuine entanglement and at variance with causal propagation of the signals [21, 23, 32].

V. CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of non-local quantum correlations, such as the entanglement between two or more systems consisting of separated quanta field, can be obtained by interpreting

measurements performed with suitable quantum detector models not inducing by theirselves non-locality. In fact non-local effects due to the use of unappropriate model detectors could lead to the development of correlations over the the whole space mimicking a not physical entanglement and even violating Einstein's causality. Thus the theory of detection is of importance in the interpretation of measurement and observability of quantum non-local effects.

Mainly two detector models are commonly used, that is GD and UDD models [16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. The difference relevant, for our purpose, between these kinds of detector models is that in the Hamiltonian describing the GD model the RWA is adopted and it thus responds only to the positive frequency of the field it detects while in the UDD model the Hamiltonian maintains the counter-rotating terms in field-detector interaction and thus responds both to positive and negative field frequencies.

Because a rigorous analysis of the measurement and observability of correlations through quantum detection processes in QFT requires the use of suitable models that can be solved exactly [27], we have used a QFT system, formed by a quantum scalar field coupled linearly to a classical scalar source localized in a finite spacetime region, that presenting these characteristics can be considered a good model[26].

The use of the GD to interpret the appearance of quantum correlations in QFT models has been questioned[12, 14, 15]. In the first part of this paper we have shown that by taking a coherent state of a quantum scalar field, whose the expectation value of the field operator given by a wave plane with a sharp front, the scalar quanta counting probability, evaluated according to the GD model, comes out different from zero before the signal reaches detector. Such a result, which is in agreement with what already obtained in the case of free electromagnetic field [14, 15], arises also the question relative to the role played by RWA in the models of quantum detection theory and its relation with the development of spurious quantum correlations at space-like distances. In the same spirit here we have extended our analysis by also examining the detection process in the case of a quantum scalar field generated by sources. We have then adopted a procedure, previously used for the electromagnetic fields case [12] that makes use of the Heinseberg picture, and then applies RWA to the formal solution of the detector-field interaction. The fields are thus obtained from the complete Hamiltonian, that describes the quantum field interacting both with the source and the detector, where also the energy non-conserving terms are kept. In

such models it is possible to calculate the detection probability rate. We have shown that by first obtaining the fields with the complete Hamiltonian, including both conserving and non-conserving energy terms, then separating the full retarded field in a retarded positive and negative frequency parts and finally applying the RWA on the field themselves , a causal rate of detection probability is obtained. This approach, due originally to Milonni, is really different from the standard application of the RWA in the Hamiltonian. It does not in fact give rise to the appearance of non-local effects in the evolution of the positive and negative frequency parts of the field. This deep difference in the final results must be associated to the fact that the spectral decomposition of the retarded positive (negative) frequency part of the field does contain both positive and negative frequencies coming from the Θ-like retarded terms. This is therefore different from the standard procedure adopted in the Glauber theory of detection where only positive or negative frequencies of the complete field are kept. Thus such an application of the RWA leads to an effective new detector model, which differs from the GD one and does not give rise to quantum correlations at space-like distances, but the causal behavior results to be put by "hand" in the solution of complete detector-field interaction.

We have shown that in our scalar model local operator function of the field develop causally from the source, nevertheless non-local effects appear in the expectation values of one-point positive localization observables, such as the Glauber and Newton-Wigner operators. The reason of this result is however that these operators do not satisfy the micro-causality principle and therefore induce, by their very definition, effects over space-like distances [25] . Thus they must not be used, for example by calculating their correlations to furnish indications of the presence of non-local effects.

A valid interpretation of the appearance of quantum correlations in our model requires to analyze realistic models that describe the detection of the scalar field generated by the source. To this end we have explicitly evaluated the response function of two detector models, that is the UDD and GD models, at rest in our reference frame in order to avoid the appearance of Unruh like effects. We have then shown that the UDD detection probability causally responds to the field generated by the source and is not characterized by non-local effects,apart from the source-independent vacuum contribution related to the UDD sensitiveness to zero point fluctuations. Anyway this term must not be considered to describe the appearance of non-locality due to the variations of the source and can in principle be

taken into account to interpret the results [21, 22, 32]. On the other hand the response function of the GD model gives source dependent terms in the detection probability rate that correspond to an instantaneous spreading of source effects over the whole space. If taken at face value this would seem to imply a violation of causal propagation of signals in our QFT system and therefore our results confirm previous ones indicating that the standard use of RWA does lead to development of non-local effects with time [21, 23, 32].

In conclusion to measure either the quantum correlations or those causal effects linked to the time varying sources in our QFT model, the adoption of the GD model, with the RWA in the Hamiltonian turns out to be unappropriate inducing by its very definition non-locality. Another detector model, the MD, obtained by anon-standard application of the RWA in the Heisenberg picture field solution, although it guarantees causality, presents the characteristic that its behavior is somehow imposed in the detection theory from the outside and one may then not be sure whether source relevant terms may also be thrown out. Instead the UDD model must be preferred to describe quantum correlation for quantized fields because the appearance of non-local effects in its response to field quanta is only due the zero point vacuum fluctuations and does not depend from the source. Moreover this behavior comes out naturally from the detection model itself. It would then be also of interest to analyze the behavior of such a quantum detector model when it or the source is in arbitrary motion in order to study the relation between the appearance of Unruh effects and non-local quantum effects.

APPENDIX A: PHOTODETECTION PROBABILITIES

Here we shall give the explicit calculation of the detection probability of the UDD and GD in our QFT system when $y_0 < t_i$.

For the UDD the source dependent contribution of response to the field is given by the second term of the right side of the expression (48). The integral appearing in it, after inserting the explicit form of Δ function, can be expressed as

$$\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}t''} \Delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}, t''-y_0)$$
$$= 2e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0} \int_{y_0}^{t} dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}(t''-y_0)} \left[-\frac{1}{4\pi}\delta(s''^2) + \frac{m\,\Theta(s''^2)}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}} J_1(m\sqrt{s''^2}) \right] \tag{A1}$$

with $s''^2=(t''-y_0)^2-r^2$ and J_1 indicating the Bessel function of first order [33]. Performing the change $t''\rightarrow s''^2$ in integration variable ($s^2(t)$ is monotone in the integration variable for t'') Eq. (A1) may be put in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\Delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y},t''-y_0)\\ &= \Theta(s_f^2)\Bigg\{\Theta(-s_i^2)\Bigg[-\frac{e^{i\omega_{eg}(r+y_0)}}{8\pi r}+e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_0^{s_f^2}\frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\,e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\,\frac{m}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}}J_1(m\sqrt{s''^2})\Bigg]\\ &+ \Theta(s_i^2)\int_{s_i^2}^{s_f^2}\frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\,e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\,\frac{m}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}}J_1(m\sqrt{s''^2})\Bigg\}\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

By using the last equation and defining the function $F_1(u^2,v^2)$ as:

$$F_1(u^2,v^2)=2e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\Bigg\{e^{i\omega_{eg}r}\left(-\frac{1}{8\pi r}\right)+\int_{v^2}^{u^2}\frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\,e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\,\frac{m}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}}J_1(m\sqrt{s''^2})\Bigg\}, \tag{A3}$$

we obtain the expression (49), whose square modulus gives the source dependent term of UDD detection probability in our QFT model.

Now we evaluate explicitly the response function of the GD when $y_0<t_i$. To this purpose we insert Eq. (45) in (52) and we obtain:

$$P_G(t_f,t_i)=c_1^2|m_{eg}|^2g^2\Theta^2(t-y_0)\left|\int_{t_i}^{t_f}dt''e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\Delta_+(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y},t''-y_0)\right|^2. \tag{A4}$$

The square modulus in the above expression can be written after decomposing Δ_+ in its real and imaginary parts as:

$$\left|\int_{t_i}^{t_f}dt''e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\Delta_+(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y},t''-y_0)\right|^2=\left|\int_{t_i}^{t_f}dt''e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\mathrm{Re}\Delta_+ + i\int_{t_i}^{t_f}dt''e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\mathrm{Im}\Delta_+\right|^2 \tag{A5}$$

Because $\mathrm{Re}\Delta_+=\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ it can be easily shown that the first term in (A5) gives a contribution proportional to the expression (A1)

$$\int_{t_i}^{t_f}dt''e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\mathrm{Re}\Delta_+(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y},t''-y_0)=\frac{1}{2}\int_{t_i}^{t_f}dt''e^{i\omega_{eg}t''}\Delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y},t''-y_0) \tag{A6}$$

Instead using the explicit forms of $\mathrm{Im}\Delta_+(x)$ for $x_0>0$ [33]

$$\mathrm{Im}\Delta_+(x) = -i\Big[\frac{m\Theta(x^2)}{8\pi\sqrt{x^2}}N_1(m\sqrt{x^2})+\frac{2m\Theta(-x^2)}{8\pi^2\sqrt{-x^2}}K_1(m\sqrt{-x^2})\Big] \tag{A7}$$

with $N_1(z)$ and $K_1(z)$ respectively the first order Neumann and Mac Donald functions and performing the change in the integration variable $t'' \rightarrow s''^2$ we can evaluate the second integral in the right side of (A5):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& i\int_{t_1}^{t_f} dt'' e^{i\omega_{eg}t''} \mathrm{Im}\Delta_+(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}, t''-y_0) = \\
& \Theta(s_f^2)\Bigg[\Theta(s_i^2) e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_{s_i^2}^{s_f^2} \frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, \frac{m}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}} N_1(m\sqrt{s''^2}) \\
& +\Theta(-s_i^2)\Bigg(e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_0^{s_f^2} \frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, \frac{m}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}} N_1(m\sqrt{s''^2}) \\
& +e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_{s_i^2}^{0} \frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, \frac{2m}{8\pi^2\sqrt{-s''^2}} K_1(m\sqrt{-s''^2})\Bigg)\Bigg] \\
& +\Theta(-s_f^2) e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_{s_i^2}^{s_f^2} \frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, \frac{2m}{8\pi^2\sqrt{-s''^2}} K_1(m\sqrt{-s''^2}) \qquad \text{(A8)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now inserting the Eqs. (A6) and (A8) in (A4) and defining the functions $F_2(u^2, v^2)$ and $F_3(u^2, v^2)$ as

$$
F_2(u^2, v^2) = e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_{v^2}^{u^2} \frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, \frac{m}{8\pi\sqrt{s''^2}} N_1(m\sqrt{s''^2}) \qquad \text{(A9)}
$$

$$
F_3(u^2, v^2) = e^{i\omega_{eg}y_0}\int_{v^2}^{u^2} \frac{ds''^2}{2\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, e^{i\omega_{eg}\sqrt{s''^2+r^2}}\, \frac{2m}{8\pi^2\sqrt{-s''^2}} K_1(m\sqrt{-s''^2}), \qquad \text{(A10)}
$$

with respect, we obtain for the GD response the expression (53).

---

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935)

[2] J.S. Bell, Physics **1**,195(1964).

[3] G.C. Hegerfeldt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2395 (1985).

[4] G.C. Hegerfeldt, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 3320 (1974).

[5] G.C. Hegerfeldt and S.N.M. Ruijsenaars, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 377 (1980).

[6] T. Petrosky, G. Ordonez, and I. Prigogine, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 042106 (2000)

[7] E. Karpov, G. Ordonez, T. Petrosky, I. Prigogine, and G. Pronko Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012103 (2000).

[8] F. Buscemi and G. Compagno,. Open Sys. & Information Dyn. **13**, 301 (2006)

[9] M.H. Rubin, Phys. Rev. D **35**, 3836 (1987).

[10] D. Buchholz and J. Yngvason, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 613 (1994).

[11] I. Antoniou I, E. Karpov, and G. Pronko, Found. of Phys. **31**, 1641 (2001).

[12] P.W. Milonni, D.F.V. James and H. Fearn, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 1525 (1995).

[13] M. Fleischhauer, J.Phys. A **31**, 453 (1998)

[14] V.P. Bykov and V.I. Tatarskii, Phys. Lett. A **136**, 77 (1989).

[15] V.I. Tatarskii, Phys. Lett.A **144**, 491 (1990).

[16] R.J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. **130**, 2529 (1963) - Phys. Rev. **131** 2766 (1963).

[17] W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).

[18] B.F. Svaiter and N.F. Svaiter, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 5267 (1992).

[19] S. Schlicht, Class.Quant.Grav. **21**, 4647 (2004).

[20] P. Langlois gr-qc/0510049

[21] G. Compagno, R. Passante and F. Persico, J. Mod. Opt. **37**, 1337 (1990).

[22] G. Compagno, G.M. Palma, R. Passante and F. Persico, Chem. Phys. **198** 19 (1995).

[23] A.A. Clerk and J.E Sipe Found. of Phys. **28**, 639 (1998).

[24] L. Maiani and M. Testa, Phys. Lett. B **356**, 319 (1995).

[25] F. Buscemi and G. Compagno, Phys. Lett. A **334**, 357 (2005).

[26] F. Buscemi and G. Compagno, J.Phys. B **39**, S695 (2006)

[27] E.A. Power and T. Thirunamachandran, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3395 (1997).

[28] J.D. Bjorken and S.D. Drell *Relativistic Quantum Fields*. (Mcgraw-Hill,1965.)

[29] M.E. Peskin and D.V. Schroeder *An introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Westview Press, 1995.)

[30] T.D. Newton and E.P. Wigner, Rev.Mod.Phys **41**, 400 (1949).

[31] G. Fleming and J. Butterfield, *Physics to Philisophy: Essays in Honor Of Micheal Redhead* (Cambridge University Press, London, 1998.)

[32] A.K. Biswas, G. Compagno, G.M. Palma, R. Passante and F. Persico Phys. Rev. A **42**, 4291 (1990).

[33] K. Gottfried and V.F. Weisskopf, *Concepts of Particle Physics vol. 1* (Oxford University Press, 1986.)